



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

waited on Governor Hughes suggesting that the State Legislature give some official recognition to the Peace Congress to be held in New York beginning on the 14th of this month, that the Legislature provide for official representation in the Congress, and that a suitable appropriation be made for the entertainment of the delegates from other states and from abroad. We have not heard what action has been taken in response to the suggestion.

. . . In our last issue we mentioned the action of the Cincinnati chamber of commerce in approving the propositions put forward last year by the Mohonk Arbitration Conference for discussion at the Hague Conference, namely, a general treaty of arbitration, the creation of a permanent congress of the nations, and the limitation and, if possible, the reduction of armaments. We have since learned from H. C. Phillips, secretary of the Mohonk Conference, that more than fifty chambers of commerce, boards of trade, etc., have taken similar action, the list including the business organizations in most of the larger cities.

. . . The Federal Council of Switzerland has voted a subvention of one thousand francs to the International Peace Bureau at Berne for its work for the current year.

. . . The Agent of the American Bible Society in Japan writes that "the liberal donation of money on the part of Christians in the United States and elsewhere has not only made a deep impression on the minds of the famine sufferers, but also on the nation, as evidence of the Christian spirit of unselfish devotion to the welfare of mankind, regardless of creed and race."

. . . At the peace meeting in London on the 22d of February, held in the studio of Mr. Felix Moscheles, Mr. W. T. Stead, just home from his European peace trip, among other things said: "We are in an enchanted forest, where nothing is real. In Germany the strongest supporter of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's peace policy is the Chancellor, Prince Bülow. The German Emperor is thought to be a menace to the peace of the world. That is all bosh,—but no greater bosh than the ideas prevailing in Germany concerning King Edward, who is described as a Black Magician, weaving spells for the destruction of the German fleet."

. . . It is proposed to "buy, repair and forever maintain the home of the Rev. S. F. Smith (author of 'America') as a memorial of him and as an object lesson in patriotism and love of country." Everybody everywhere is invited to contribute twenty-five cents, and to send it in stamps, if that is more convenient, to D. C. Heath, secretary Smith Memorial Committee, 120 Boylston Street, Boston. This is the kind of monument in which the friends of peace believe, and they will be all the more inclined to contribute in this instance as "America" is the only national hymn, so far as we know, which is entirely free from any suggestion of war or glorification of the war spirit.

. . . The British government has just had its present navy appraised and has found its value to be six hundred and seventy million dollars.

The Reign of Violence is O'er.

(From Longfellow's "The Oscultation of Orion.")

Then through the silence overhead,
An angel with a trumpet said,
"Forevermore, forevermore,
The reign of violence is o'er!"
And, like an instrument that flings
Its music on another's strings,
The trumpet of the angel cast
Upon the heavenly lyre its blast,
And on from sphere to sphere the words
Reechoed down the burning chords,—
"Forevermore, forevermore,
The reign of violence is o'er!"

Peace.

BY KENNETH BRUCE.

Not for thee, proud Holland, is the boast
Of peace fulfilled, nor yet has Hague's fair name
Been hailed as leader of that honored host
Who sought through war's quick death enduring fame.
Thy patriot's fervor humbled haughty Spain;
Thy ocean-bulwarks bade her bow the knee;
But peace 'twixt man and man thou could'st not gair;
Thy precious gift belongs to Liberty.

To thee, Columbia, Goddess of the Free!
The nations turn and raise their suppliant prayer;
Strike gun from fort and ship, till every sea
Shall fling fair freedom's banner to the air.
Then shall the nations rest and fierce war cease,
Lapped in the arms of Universal Peace.

The Hague Conference and the Limitation of Armaments.

BY THE BRITISH PRIME MINISTER.

From the "Nation," the New Liberal Weekly.

The disposition shown by certain powers, of whom Great Britain is one, to raise the question of the limitation of armaments at the approaching Hague Conference, has evoked some objections both at home and abroad, on the ground that such action would be ill-timed, inconvenient and mischievous. I wish to indicate, as briefly as may be, my reasons for holding these objections to be baseless.

It should be borne in mind that the original Conference at The Hague was convened for the purpose of raising this very question, and in the hope that the powers might arrive at an understanding calculated to afford some measure of relief from an excessive and ever-increasing burden. The hope was not fulfilled, nor was it to be expected that agreement on so delicate and complex a matter would be reached at the first attempt; but, on the other hand, I have never heard it suggested that the discussion left behind it any injurious consequences. I submit that it is the business of those who are opposed to the renewal of the attempt to show that some special and essential change of circumstances has arisen, such as to render unnecessary, inopportune, or positively mischievous, a course adopted with general approbation in 1898.

Nothing of the kind has, so far as I know, been attempted, and I doubt if it could be undertaken with any hope of success. It was desirable in 1898 to lighten the burden of armaments; but that consummation is not less desirable to-day, when the weight of the burden has been enormously increased. In 1898 it was already

perceived that the endless multiplication of the engines of war was futile and self-defeating; and the years that have passed have only served to strengthen and intensify that impression. In regard to the struggle for sea power, it was suspected that no limits could be set to the competition, save by a process of economic exhaustion, since the natural checks imposed on military power by frontiers and considerations of population have no counterpart upon the seas; and again, we find that the suspicion has grown to something like a certainty to-day.

On the other hand, I am aware of no special circumstances which would make the submission of this question to the Conference a matter of international misgiving. It would surprise me to hear it alleged that the interests of the powers in any respect impose on them a divergence of standpoint so absolute and irreconcilable that the mere discussion of the limitation of armaments would be fraught with danger. Here, again, it seems to me that we do well to fortify ourselves from recent experience. Since the first Hague Conference was held, the points of disagreement between the powers have become not more, but less acute; they are confined to a far smaller field; the sentiment in favor of peace, so far as can be judged, has become incomparably stronger and more constant; and the idea of arbitration and the peaceful adjustment of international disputes has attained a practical potency and a moral authority undreamt of in 1898. These are considerations as to which the least that can be said is that they should be allowed their due weight; and, in face of them, I suggest that only upon one hypothesis can the submission of this grave matter to the Conference be set down as inadmissible; namely, that guarantees of peace, be they what they may, are to be treated as having no practical bearing on the scale and intensity of warlike preparations.

That would be a lame and impotent conclusion, calculated to undermine the moral position of the Conference, and to stultify its proceedings in the eye of the world. It would amount to a declaration that the common interest of peace, proclaimed for the first time by the community of nations assembled at The Hague, and carried forward since then by successive stages, with a rapidity beyond the dreams of the most sanguine, has been confided to the guardianship of the Admiralties and War Offices of the powers.

Let me, in conclusion, say a word as to the part of Great Britain. We have already given earnest of our sincerity by the considerable reductions that have been effected in our naval and military expenditure, as well as by the undertaking that we are prepared to go further, if we find a similar disposition in other quarters. Our delegates, therefore, will not go into the Conference empty-handed. It has, however, been suggested that our example will count for nothing, because our preponderant naval position will still remain unimpaired. I do not believe it. The sea power of this country implies no challenge to any single state or group of states. I am persuaded that throughout the world that power is recognized as non-aggressive and innocent of designs against the independence, the commercial freedom, and the legitimate development of other states, and that it is, therefore, a mistake to imagine that the naval powers will be disposed to regard our position on the sea as a bar to any proposal for the arrest of armaments or to

the calling of a temporary truce. The truth appears to me to lie in the opposite direction. Our known adhesion to those two dominant principles—the independence of nationalities and the freedom of trade—entitles us of itself to claim that if our fleets be invulnerable, they carry with them no menace across the waters of the world, but a message of the most cordial goodwill, based on a belief in the community of interests between the nations.

HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN.

World-Sovereignty Already a Fact.

BY RAYMOND L. BRIDGMAN.

[The prominence into which the subject of a Periodic Congress or Parliament of the Nations has recently come makes this article on World-Sovereignty a most timely and important one. The Interparliamentary Union, the Peace Congresses, the Mohonk Arbitration Conference, and other bodies, have strongly endorsed the idea and are making every effort to secure the consideration of the subject at the coming Hague Conference. It is even proposed by the Interparliamentary Union that, as a beginning, the Hague Conference itself should be made periodic and automatic.]

The writer of this article, Mr. Raymond L. Bridgman, is well known as the Boston Correspondent of the *Springfield Republican* and the author of "World Organization," in which the whole subject of an international state is thoroughly and ably discussed.]

Just as was expected in the advance of the movement for the organization of the nations into one political body, the assertion of national sovereignty stands already revealed as the greatest obstacle to the development of the unity of the world. Pride and fear of loss of power both enter into the feeling of opposition.

Yet it is only a reasonable and practical proposition which is advanced. The world-sovereignty proposed does not interfere with rightful national sovereignty, any more than the sovereignty of the United States interferes with the local sovereignty of the States. It would be well for the objectors, some of whom occupy influential positions, to recognize the facts before they take a position which is already proved to be untenable. National sovereignty has nothing to fear from full recognition of the fact of international or world-sovereignty. The authority of mankind, for the benefit of mankind, will not interfere with the exercise of the sovereignty of the nations within their sphere, and that is the only sphere over which they can claim sovereignty, either now or for any time to come. All the jealousy over the supposed encroachments upon the rights of the nations to govern their own peoples and to administer their own affairs is as out of place as would be jealousy of our States over their right to make their own laws for the preservation of the public peace, for the management and transmission of property, or for the education of the children and the administration of the public charities. In local affairs the nations would continue to exercise the same authority which they now have.

Again, it is to be noticed that world-sovereignty already exists, and that the nations already recognize it and obey it, though the precise statement of the fact in this form is not yet popularly appreciated. International law is recognized as having binding force upon the nations in certain aspects. Let it be admitted that there is a wide fringe of this law which is in doubt, that there is an undesirable zone of disputed propositions, and that there is no world-army to enforce the so-called